DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 563 SP 004 143

AUTHOR Ornstein, Allan C.
TITLE Selected Teacher Behaviors Considered as a Basis for Reporting Recommended Strategies for Teaching the Disadvantaged: A Review.
INSTITUTION New York Univ., N.Y.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.25
DESCRIPTORS Affective Behavior, Class Management, Cognitive Development, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Teacher Behavior

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the research and commentary literature on techniques, traits, and success factors for teachers of the disadvantaged. The author categorizes and discusses behaviors for teachers of the disadvantaged within four selected dimensions: 1) Affective (related to the teacher's attitudes, emotions, feelings, and values), 2) Cognitive (related to the teaching of a subject and the teacher's development of the students' intellectual competencies), 3) Controlling (related to the teacher's order, planning, tasks, responsibility, and systemization), and 4) Stable (related to the teacher's calmness, objectivity, consistency, confidence, and alertness). The brief summary section concludes that although research on teacher behavior is impressive in quantity, the results are contradictory and concern for teachers of the disadvantaged inadequate and that this review, while not providing answers, might be used as a reference point in seeking answers to questions on what behavior is desirable for teachers of the disadvantaged. One hundred forty-two references are cited, nearly all published in the 1960's. (JS)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Allan C. Ornstein

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

ED043563

Selected Teacher Behaviors Considered as a Basis for Reporting Recommended Strategies for Teaching the Disadvantaged: A Review[1]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Allan C. Ornstein

Introduction[2]

Thelen (1967) indicates that teachers and students vary, and the crucial problem is to get the right combination for the most effective teaching-learning process. Fantini and Weinstein (1968) refer to this as a "match" of teacher behaviors with learning styles of the disadvantaged, whereas M. L. Goldberg (1964) calls it the "fit" and Wilkerson (1964) calls it the "interaction" between teachers of the disadvantaged and their students.

Phillips (1967) points out that children and teachers are different; the analysis of teacher behavior should be directed toward obtaining the right "mesh" or best combination. Orleans, Clarke, Ostreicher, and Standlee (1952) believe that it is essential to classify what kinds of teacher behavior are effective with different kinds of students. Thelen (1969) believes that the most important thing is to give teachers a "compatible"

---

[1]This article is based on the author's first draft of his thesis chapter entitled, "Related Literature." In Selected teacher behavior attributes rated as desirable by ninth-grade disadvantaged students and ninth-grade teachers of the disadvantaged. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, expected 1970.

[2]The terms "disadvantaged" and "lower-class" students are used interchangeably throughout this article, reflecting the different investigators' usage.

SP004143

class, a class they can work with and teach. M. L. Goldberg (1964) is of the opinion that teacher behavior and effectiveness vary with different students. The importance of effectiveness is evidenced by two recent reports (Massachusetts State Board of Education, 1965; Passow, 1967), affirming that a teacher who is effective with middle-class students will not necessarily be effective with disadvantaged students. Jackson (1957), Kirman (1964), and Washburne and Heil (1960) point out that two teachers may have very different results with the same students or class, ranging from bedlam to rapport, and from nonteaching to cogent teaching. Battle (1954) points out the degree of similarity between teachers' values and those of students to achieve as measured by the teachers' grades. Coleman (1968) asserts that a "good" teacher tends to influence the achievement of disadvantaged students more than that of middle-class students.

In the literature on teacher behavior and the disadvantaged, the research on teacher behavior seems general in nature, not specifically related to teachers of the disadvantaged. Similarly, the research on the disadvantaged seems primarily concerned with the children's and youth's socio-psychological problems, not specifically related to their teachers' behavior or interaction. However, there is a great deal of commentary about techniques, traits, and success factors for teachers of the disadvantaged - referred to in this article as teacher behaviors. Thus, much of the literature included in this review is based on commentary rather than on research.

Although an objective or valid list of teacher behaviors is difficult, if not impossible to prescribe (Klopf & Bowman, 1967; Task Force One, 1965), this author will categorize and discuss behaviors for teachers of the disadvantaged within four selected dimensions: (1) Affective (related to the teacher's

attitudes, emotions, feelings, and values), (2) Cognitive (related to the teaching of a subject and the teacher's development of the students' intellectual competencies), (3) Controlling (related to the teacher's order, planning, tasks, responsibility, and systemization), and (4) Stable (related to the teacher's calmness, objectivity, consistency, confidence, and alertness.

As one reads the list of teacher behaviors, it becomes apparent that no teacher can possess all the desired qualities of behavior. A given teacher behavior may overlap into or be included in another dimension. The difficulty of distinguishing between a behavior and an attitude is sometimes a problem of semantics and subjectivity. Finally, in some cases, for the sake of brevity, a number of related teacher behaviors have been categorized into a broad characteristic.

Affective Teacher Behaviors

D. P. Ausubel (1967), Congreve (1969), Crow, Murray, and Smythe (1966), Riessman (1966), and Sexton (1961) contend that manifesting dedication or desire to teach the disadvantaged is important. Riessman (1966) believes the teacher should be able to identify with the underdog. Rousseve (1963) and Sexton (1961) feel the teacher should possess a reformer's zeal for teaching the disadvantaged. Wayson (1966) found that one of the behaviors teachers of the disadvantaged rated as desirable was "missionary zeal." Although Havighurst (1968) contends that the "motivating element" is an important quality for teachers of the disadvantaged, elsewhere (1967) he found that out of 5,000 randomly selected elementary-school teachers from Chicago, 22% of those who were teaching disadvantaged students perceived their position as being "unfavorable" or "very unfavorable"; only 4% of the teachers in upper- and middle-class schools did so. In this connection,

Coleman (1966) and Passow (1967) found that teachers, regardless of race, prefer to teach in middle-class schools. Studies by Gottlieb (1964b), McCallon (1966), and Wayson (1966) indicate that with teaching the disadvantaged, job satisfaction decreases with increased years of employment. Dlabal (1966) compared 30 teachers who liked working with the disadvantaged with 30 who disliked working with the disadvantaged. The former group scored significiantly higher (.05 level) on the California Psychological Inventory in Sociability and Tolerance, which may be considered as affective in nature.

Crow et al. (1966), Dlabal (1966), Ellis (1965), Gordon (1965), Linn (1966), and Rivlin (1966) are of the opinion that the teacher should manifest socio-psychological understanding of the disadvantaged. Congreve (1969), Gordon (1965), Riessman (1962), and Strom (1965) maintain the teacher should be aware of the student's mental or learning styles.

Goff (1954) reports that Negro disadvantaged children from six to fourteen show a significant (.01 level) decrease in confidence with increase of age. She (1954) recommends, along with D. P. Ausubel and P. Ausubel (1963), Bowman (1966), Clift (1969), Havighurst (1968), Kvaraceus (1965), and Whipple (1967) that teachers counteract this tendency with behaviors that raise the disadvantaged child's self-concept and/or ego-development. In this connection, Wirth (1966) found that disadvantaged children's self-concepts were significantly related to the perceptions of the teacher's feelings toward them in 21 out of 25 classes. Paschal (1966) showed that disadvantaged students substantially gain in achievement when their teacher's attitudes and behaviors are ego-supporting of them.

Being empathic to the needs and/or problems of the disadvantaged is desirable, according to Bernstein (1967), Cheyney (1966), Cauman (1966),

and Tanner (1967). Lail (1968) found that ninth-grade disadvantaged students differ from their middle-class counterparts in their concern for their own sex and work developmental tasks (at the .05 and .01 levels respectively). Howard (1968) reported that disadvantaged students' perceptions of their needs and problems and their teachers' perceptions of these needs and problems are significantly different in twelve areas at the .01 level and fourteen areas at the .05 level, for a total of 26 significantly different comparisons out of a possible 80 combinations. Gottlieb (1964a) showed that Negro disadvantaged youth perceive their teachers as unable to understand them in terms of their educational goals.

Manifesting warmth is considered desirable by Bloom, Davis, and Hess (1965), M. L. Goldberg (1964), Hawk (1967), and Malone (1968). Engle, Davis, and Mazer (1968) reported that lower-class high-school students had significantly fewer absentees and latenesses with warm teachers. Getzels and Jackson (1963) indicate that teachers tend to be warm with students they like, but as indicated elsewhere[3], many teachers of the disadvantaged dislike their students. Also, Perkins (1965) and Yee (1968) found that teachers tend to be more critical and less warm with underachieving and lower-class students than with achieving and middle-class students respectively.

Bereiter and Englemann (1966), Epps (1970), Inman (1968), and Riessman (1966) recommend that the teacher give genuine praise. Clark and Walberg (1968) divided 110 inner-city junior-high-school potential dropouts into two groups, whose difference in mean I. Q. was 1.32. The group that was verbally rewarded by their teachers scored significantly higher (.01) on their reading tests. Data by Douvan (1956) and Gerwirtz and Baer (1958)

---

[3]Chapter 3 of author's thesis.

confirm that lower-class students are more responsive to approval, significant at the .01 level. However, Rosenhan and Greenwald (1965) showed there was no difference between lower-class and middle-class students in their tendency to respond to verbal reinforcement.

Cognitive Teacher Behaviors

Fantini and Weinstein (1968), Gordon (1965), Kornberg (1963), McGeoch (1965), and Rivlin (1966) believe it is important for the teacher to be competent in his subject area. H. A. Johnson (1968), Klopf and Bowman (1967), Singer (1968), and Tanner (1967) maintain that the teacher should have the knowledge and ability of working current instructional devices. Inman (1968), H. A. Johnson (1968), Singer (1968), Taba and Elkins (1966), and Williams (1968) believe the teacher should utilize multimedia or audiovisual materials. McGeoch (1965) and Riessman (1962) assert that the lessons should be well-planned, while Crow et al. (1966) and McGeoch (1965) are of the opinion that the pace of the lesson should be varied. Bernstein (1966), Blank and Solomon (1969), and Torrance (1966) contend that the teacher should formulate good questions. D.P. Ausubel (1967), Epstein, Fink, and Hauserman (1967), M. L. Goldberg (1964), Matczynski (1968), Rousseve (1963), Vontress (1963), and Wilcox (1967) assert the importance of the teacher communicating a sense of excitement and enthusiasm while teaching. In this connection, Ryans (1960) found sifnificant F ratios at the .05 level for stimulating, imaginative, and verbally understanding teachers who worked effectively with students from low socio-economic backgrounds. Mastin (1963) found a significant gain in student achievement for 15 classes at the .01 level and for one additional class at the .05 level out of 20 inner-city classes when lessons were taught with "apparent enthusiasm" versus "lack of enthusiasm."

Several different instructional activities are recommended for teachers of the disadvantaged. Bereiter and Englemann (1966), Elkins (1969), Cooper (1968), and Taba and Elkins (1966) suggest dramatizing. Allen (1967), Crystal (1969), Levine(1968), Loretan and Unmans (1966), and Taba and Elkins (1966) maintain that role playing is desirable. Bereiter and Englemann (1966), Fantini and Weinstein (1968), Strang (1967), and Whipple (1967) suggest reading activities. With regard to appealing to the senses, C. P. Deutsch (1964), M. Deutsch (1963), Ellis (1965), Hunt (1964), and Whipple (1967) recommend listening activities. Levine (1968), Matczynski (1968), Riessman (1966), and Strom (1965) suggest physical or motor activities are important.

Various methods of organizing the subject are suggested. Bowman (1966), Elkins (1969), Storen (1968), Tiedt (1968), and Torrance (1966) assert that the teacher should permit students to explore ideas. Barnard (1967), Fantini and Weinstein (1968), and Trout (1967) believe the teacher should explore the subject of racial prejudice. Roth (1969) indicates that black students exposed to black studies have a significantly more positive (.01 level) concept of black people than black students without such exposure. Baker's (1968) data of responses of 242 disadvantaged students to six possible story preferences point out the students most often preferred reading materials related to their heritage.

Allen (1967), Bereiter and Englemann (1966), Hayes (1964), and G. O. Johnson (1966) maintain that drill and repetition are necessary, but C. P. Deutsch (1964) warns that too much repetition will lead to student boredom. M. Deutsch (1963), Gordon (1965), Haberman (1965), and Hunt (1964) contend

that the teacher organize materials according to the students' experiences or developmental level, rather than their chronological level.

Glasman (1970), Goff (1964), Strom (1965), and Taba and Elkins (1966) maintain that the teacher should individualize learning. In this connection, Painter (1969) showed that individualized tutoring for the disadvantaged has significant positive effects on their achievement for 8 out of 26 cognitive areas of learning.

D. Ausubel (1967), Bloom (1964), C. P. Deutsch (1964), Ellis (1965), and Hunt (1961, 1964) are of the opinion that there may be "critical" or optimal periods when the student is most susceptible to learning; the opinion that there may be optimal periods of readiness suggests that teacher should provide appropriate experiences basic to the student's intellectual development. This is what Hunt (1964) terms the "match." Failure to match the student's cognitive development with appropriate learning experiences may lead to what D. Ausubel (1967), Bruner (1966), Clark (1965), and Hunt (1964) term the "cumulative nature of the intellectual deficit."

Warren (1968) found that lower-class high-school seniors tended to select more cognitive than affective behaviors in perceiving an effective teacher. With this in mind, as well as the above theories of "critical" periods and "intellectual deficits," it might be beneficial for teachers of the disadvantaged, and for that matter, all teachers, to formulate their teaching strategies along some known system of cognitive development or learning, for example, those expressed by Bloom et al. (1956), Bruner (1960), and/or Guilford (1966).

Controlling Teacher Behaviors

According to the studies of Barter (1968-1969), Passow (1967), and V. Scott (1967), as well as the observations of M. Deutsch (1960), Eddy (1967),

Leacock (1969), and Moore (1967), discipline problems are considered by inner-city teachers of the disadvantaged to be a major factor in interfering with their teaching. Wayson (1966) interviewed 42 teachers of the disadvantaged to determine job satisfaction and found that all teachers, including those who were satisfied with their present position, had resorted to corporal punishment at one time or another.

Fantini and Weinstein (1968) and Glasman (1970) advise that the teacher give clear directions, while McGeoch (1965) and Tanner (1967) suggest that the teacher communicate effectively. Hayes (1964), Haubrich (1965), Kirman (1964), Kornberg (1963), and McGeoch (1965) affirm that good rules and routine are desirable, whereas Fantini and Weinstein (1968) and Riessman (1962) warn that the teacher needs to enforce his rules. Crow et al. (1966), McGeoch (1965), and Tanner (1967) are of the opinion that consistency with class routine is important. Of all the successful different styles for teaching the disadvantaged, Riessman (1962) believes the key is is consistency. Crow et al. (1966), Fantini and Weinstein (1968), Klopf and Bowman (1967), Kornberg (1963), and McGeoch (1965) claim that a well-organized, structured classroom is desirable. According to Ornstein (1969a) and Riessman (1962), the students should know what to do or expect. Fantini and Weinstein (1968), M. L. Goldberg (1964), and Riessman (1962) point out the necessity of setting up boundaries or limitations - a measure of freedom of restraint while at the same time establishing limits of acceptable behavior.

Miller's (1968) study showed that 620 preservice teachers expressing a desire to teach in inner-city schools serving the disadvantaged, and whose views of these schools are more positive, tend to accept permissive and psychologically-oriented norms for dealing with students. Riessman

(1962) contends, however, that the permissive teacher is ineffective with the disadvantaged, while the strict, structured teacher is effective and popular with such students. Both Gordon (1965) and Riessman (1962) affirm that perhaps the best teacher is one who combines both traditionalism - structure, rules, discipline, order, and organization - with progressivism - motivation, learning by doing, utilizing students' experiences and culture, and moving toward the abstract.

The "traditional" teacher seems similar to Cogan's (1968) "conjunctive" teacher - one who is task-oriented and structured. Data were collected from 33 teachers and 987 eighth-grade students in 5 different junior high schools from "two sharply different socio-economic" communities. Scores on "conjunctive" teacher behavior were positively related to scores on student work performance, both required and self-initiated, from both types of school settings.

Heil and Washburne (1962) classified three types of teachers and five types of students from 55 classes from three types of socio-economic levels - 1/3 lower-, 1/3 middle-, and 1/3 upper-class. The "self-controlling" teacher - concerned with structure, order, planning, and tasks - was significantly more effective than the other types of teachers in terms of student achievement, with "opposing" and "wavering" students - students described as negative and hostile - students implied by M. L. Goldberg (1964) as being disadvantaged.

On the other hand, the "conjunctive" and "self-controlled" teachers seem to possess a number of characteristics which Flanders (1965) would classify as being "direct" and authoritarian - teacher-centered - and least effective with all types of students. Jackson (1957) found that lower-class students achieve more (.01 level) over a period of one year with student-centered teachers compared to teacher-centered teachers. Bridges (1968) found that principals of both working-class and middle-class schools

significantly (.001) rate the best possibility of success for a teacher who relates affectively to his students than one who is task-oriented, regardless of grade level.

According to Anderson, Brewer, and Reed (1946), Perkins (1951), and Withall (1948), as well as Flanders (1965), task-oriented or teacher-centered teachers tend to be more authoritarian than student-centered teachers. In this connection, Passow (1967) found that teachers who are assigned to lower-track students, as opposed to honor-track students, tend to be more authoritarian. At the two extremes, 38% of the lower-track teachers scored higher in authoritarianism and only 4.5% of the honor-track teachers scored high in authoritarianism. Wayson (1966) reported that teachers of the disadvantaged tend to impose their will on students in determining and planning the lesson. Yee (1968) indicates that teachers who interact with lower-class students (over a period of two years) become more domineering and students become more submissive. This "business-like," authoritarian approach is advocated by the Bereiter and Englemann (1966) classes. While Bereiter and Englemann (1966) contend that a structured, authoritarian approach does not suppress creativity, Turner and Denny (1969) found that high scores of organization tend to represent teachers who have good classroom control, but that this control is gained at the expense of reducing student creativity at the .05 level.

According to J. B. Goldberg (1968), students who are less concerned with school work - which tends to fit Heil and Washburne's "opposers" and "waverers," Passow's lower-track students, Wayson's disadvantaged students, and Yee's lower-class students - view teachers as more authoritarian, significant at the .05 level. Dolger and Ginandes (1946) found that lower-class students, when

compared with middle-class students, select as more desirable those discipline techniques that involve authority or punitive measures, rather than permissive, amicable solutions. Here, the teachers' authoritarianism may be influenced by their students' perception of desirable authoritarian behavior, or the students' perception of desirable authoritarian behavior may be influenced by their teachers' behavior. The first possibility would be set forth by Keislar and McNeil (1959), who showed that teacher behavior is a significant (.05) function of student behavior. The second possibility would be argued by Yee (1968), who indicates that student behavior is in response to teacher behavior.

Stable Teacher Behaviors

Cheyney (1966), Inman (1968), Tanner (1967), and Torrance (1966) affirm the necessity for the teacher to be open to change - both adaptable and flexible. Haubrich (1965) and Riessman (1962) contend that the teacher should have the ability to adjust to new situations. V. Scott (1967) points out that teachers of the disadvantaged are confronted with varied teaching situations. Fantini and Weinstein (1968) and Riessman (1962) suggest that the teacher be able to analyze and/or cope with the students' tests and "roll with the punches" without getting upset. In this connection, Cheyney (1966), Levine (1968), and McGeoch (1965) are of the opinion that the teacher should have a sense of humor.

Crow et al. (1966), Elkins (1969), Gordon (1965), Klopf and Bowman (1967), and Strom (1966) claim the teacher should have insight into interpersonal and/or intrapersonal relations. M. L. Goldberg (1964), Haubrich (1965), G. O. Johnson (1966), and Williams (1968) maintain that the teacher should be able to cope with emotional stress or frustrating, deviant behavior.

Crow et al. (1966), Kirman (1964), and Riessman (1962) suggest that the teacher control himself when confronted with such behavior, whereas Inman (1968), Klopf and Bowman (1967), and W. S. Scott (1967) maintain that the teacher should not take students' behavior manifestations personally. M. L. Goldberg (1964) and G. O. Johnson (1966) point out that the teacher should accept but not condone irrational student behavior. Kounin and Gump (1958) show that control techniques high in clarity (e. g., defining the misconduct and explaining how to stop) are significantly more successful at the .01 level for control's sake than punitive measures (e. g., roughness, anger, or physical handling). In another study, Kounin and Gump (1961) found that punitive teachers foster significantly more (at the .05 level) student aggression and more anxiety in school than non-punitive teachers. This may be considered relevant in view of Wayson's (1966) findings that all 42 inner-city teachers he interviewed had resorted to corporal punishment sometime with their students.

Summary

A final aim of teacher behavior research should be the formulation of behavior guides, especially for teachers of the disadvantaged. Though the research on teacher behavior is impressive in quanity, the results are somewhat contradictory and concern for teachers of the disadvantaged is inadequate. In this connection, the literature indicates (Miller, 1967; Ornstein, 1968, 1969b; Task Force One, 1965) that the disadvantaged depend on good teaching and teachers are failing to reach and teach the disadvantaged. None of the programs and policies for educating the disadvantaged, according to Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) and Ornstein (1969b), has come up with a substitute for positive teacher behavior. Providing research data on teacher behavior

for the disadvantaged can benefit both teachers and students. In effect, this review introduces the reader to some recent ideas and raises questions - although it does not provide answers[4], it can be used as a reference point to answer questions - on what behavior is desirable for teachers of the disadvantaged.

---

[4]Chapter 8 of the author's thesis presents 25 selected recommendations for research on teacher behavior.

REFERENCES

Allen, V. F. Teaching standard English as a second dialect. Teachers College Record, 1967, 68, 355-370.

Anderson, H. H., Brewer, J. E., & Reed, M. F. Studies of teachers' classroom personalities, III. Applied Psychology Monograph, 1946, No. 11.

Ausubel, D. P. How reversible are the cognitive and motivational effects of cultural deprivation? Implications for teaching the culturally deprived child. In A. H. Passow, M. Goldberg, & A. J. Tannenbaum (Eds.), Education of the disadvantaged. New York: Holt, 1967. Pp. 306-326.

Ausubel, D. P., & Ausubel, P. Ego development among Negro children. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), Education in depressed areas. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963. Pp. 109-141.

Baker, E. H. Motivation for the disadvantaged, special problems. Grade Teacher, 1968, 85, 104-107.

Barnard, H. V. New students, new teachers, new programs to meet new demands. In M. Cowles (Ed.), Perspectives in the education of disadvantaged children. Cleveland: World, 1967. Pp. 273-288.

Barter, A. K. Education's disadvantaged: Profile of a teacher. Educational Horizons, 1968-69, 47, 82-92.

Battle, H. J. Application of invert analysis in a study of the relations between values and achievement of high school pupils. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954.

Bereiter, C., & Englemann, S. Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Bernstein, A. The education of urban populations. New York: Random, 1967.

Blank, M., & Solomon, F. How shall the disadvantaged child be taught? Child Development, 1969, 40, 47-61.

Bloom, B. S. Stability and change in human characteristics. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Bloom, B. S., Davis, A., & Hess, R. Compensatory education for cultural deprivation. New York: Holt, 1965.

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.), Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H. & Krathwohl, D. R. Taxonomy of educational objectives, the classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York: McKay, 1956.

Bowman, P. H. Improving the pupil self concept. In R. D. Strom (Ed.), The inner-city classroom: Teacher behaviors. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1966. Pp. 75-91.

Bridges, E. M. Preference of principals for instructional and expressive characteristics of teachers. School Review, 1968, 76, 324-338.

Bruner, J. S. The process of education. (Vintage ed., n.d.) Cambridge: Harvard, 1960.

Bruner, J. S. The cognitive consequences of early sensory deprivation. In J. F. Frost & G. R. Hawkes (Eds.), The disadvantaged child: Issues and innovations. Boston: Houghton, 1966. Pp. 137-144.

Cauman, J. The fine art of follow-through. Grade Teacher, 1966, 84, 104, 106-107.

Cheyney, A. B. Teachers of the culturally disadvantaged. Exceptional Children, 1966, 33, 83-88.

Clark, C. A., & Walberg, H. J. The influence of massive rewards on reading achievement in potential urban school dropouts. American Educational Research Journal, 1968, 5, 305-310.

Clark, K. B. Dark ghetto. New York: Harper, 1965.

Clift, V. A. Curriculum strategy based on the personality characteristics of disadvantaged youth. Journal of Negro Education, 1969, 38, 94-104.

Cogan, M. L. The behavior of teachers and the productive behavior of their pupils, II: trait analysis. Journal of Experimental Education, 1968, 27, 89-105.

Coleman, J. S. Equality of educational opportunity. Vol. 1. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coleman, J. S. Equality of educational opportunity. Integrated Education, 1968, 6, 19-28.

Congreve, W. J. Humanizing teaching. In R. F. Campbell, L. A. Marx, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Education and urban renaissance. New York: Wiley, 1969. Pp. 53-62.

Cooper, D. Relevancy and involvement: Literature for the disadvantaged. English Record, 1968, 19, 47-51.

Crow, L. D., Murray, W. I., & Smythe, H. H. Educating the culturally disadvantaged child. New York: McKay, 1966.

Crystal, J. Role playing in a troubled class. Elementary School Journal, 1969, 69, 169-179.

Deutsch, C. P. Auditory discrimination and learning: Social factors. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 277-296.

Deutsch, M. Minority group and class status as related to social and personality factors in scholastic achievement. Ithaca, New York: Society for Applied Anthropology, 1960, Monograph No. 2.

Deutsch, M. The disadvantaged child and the learning process. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), Education in depressed areas. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963. Pp. 163-179.

Dlabal, J. J., Jr. A study to identify distinguishing characteristics of teachers who work successfully with culturally disadvantaged children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1966.

Dolger, L., & Ginandes, J. Children's attitudes toward discipline as related to socioeconomic status. Journal of Experimental Education, 1946, 15, 161-165.

Douvan, E. Social status and success strivings. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 219-223.

Eddy, E. M. Walk the white line: A profile of urban education. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1967.

Elkins, D. Instructional guidelines for teachers of the disadvantaged. Record, 1969, 70, 593-615.

Ellis, R. R. Looking toward desired behaviors in teachers of the disadvantaged. In M. D. Usdan & F. Bertolaet (Eds.), Development of school-university programs for the pre-service education of teachers for the disadvantaged through teacher education centers. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965, Research Project No. F-068. Pp. 26-38.

Engle, K. B., Davis, D. A., & Mazer, G. E. Interpersonal effects on under-achievers. Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 61, 208-210.

Epps, E. G. Interpersonal relations and motivation: Implications for teachers of disadvantaged children. Journal of Negro Education, 1970, 39, 14-25.

Epstein, J., Fink, C. H., & Hauserman, B. D. Teachers for the disadvantaged: Project mission. National Elementary Principal, 1967, 46, 13-16.

Fantini, M. D., & Weinstein, G. The disadvantaged: Challenge to education. New York: Harper, 1968.

Flanders, N. A. Teacher influence, pupil attitude and achievement. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965, Monograph No. 12.

Fuchs, E. Teachers talk: Views from inside city schools. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Gerwirtz, J. L.,& Baer, D. M. The effect of brief social deprivation for a social reinforcer. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 49-56.

Getzels, J. W., & Jackson, P. W. The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963. Pp. 506-582.

Glasman, N. S. Teachers' low expectation levels of their culturally different students: A view from administration. Journal of Secondary Education, 1970, 45, 82-94.

Goff, R. M. Some educational implications of the influence of rejection on aspiration levels of minority group children. Journal of Experimental Education, 1954, 23, 179-183.

Goldberg, J. B. Influence of pupils' attitudes on perceptions of teachers' behaviors and on consequent school work. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 59, 1-5.

Goldberg, M. L. Adapting teacher style to pupil differences: Teachers for disadvantaged children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 161-178.

Gordon, E. W. Desired teacher behavior in schools for socially disadvantaged children. In M. D. Usdan & F. Bertolaet (Eds.), Development of school-university programs for the pre-service education of teachers for the disadvantaged through teacher education centers. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965, Research Project No. F-068. Pp. 39-48.

Gordon, E. W., & Wilkerson, D. A. Compensatory education for the disadvantaged programs and practices: Preschool through college. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Gottlieb, D. Goal aspiration and goal fulfillments: Difference between deprived and affluent American adolescents. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1964, 34, 934-941. (a)

Gottlieb, D. Teaching and students: The views of Negro and white teachers. Sociology of Education, 1964, 37, 345-353. (b)

Guilford, J. P. Intelligence: 1965 model. American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 20-26.

Haberman, M. The professional sequence for preparing urban teachers. In M. D. Usdan and F. Bertolaet (Eds.), Development of school-university programs for the pre-service education of teachers for the disadvantaged through teacher education centers. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965, Research Project No. F-068. Pp. 100-120.

Haubrich, V. F. Teachers for big-city schools. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), Education in depressed areas. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963. Pp. 243-261.

Havighurst, R. J. Teachers in Chicago schools. In J. I. Roberts (Ed.), School children in the urban slum. New York: Free Press, 1967. Pp. 554-560.

Havighurst, R. J. Requirements for a valid "new criticism." Phi Delta Kappan, 1968, 50, 20-26.

Hawk, T. L. Self-concepts of the socially disadvantaged. Elementary School Journal, 1967, 67, 196-206.

Hayes, H. Some ways to teach culturally deprived children. Chicago Schools Journal, 1964, 45, 221-228.

Heil, L. M., & Washburne, C. Brooklyn College research in teacher effectiveness. Journal of Educational Research, 1962, 55, 347-351.

Herriott, R. E., & St. John, N. H. Social class and the urban school. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Howard, D. P. The needs and problems of socially disadvantaged children as perceived by students and teachers. Exceptional Children, 1968, 34, 327-335.

Hunt, J. M. Intelligence and experience. New York: Ronald Press, 1961.

Hunt, J. M. The psychological basis for using pre-school enrichment as an antidote for cultural deprivation. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 209-248.

Inman, T. H. Educating teachers for the disadvantaged. Journal of Business Education, 1968, 43, 268-269.

Jackson, J. H. The relationship between psychological climate and the quality of learning outcomes among lower-status pupils in the classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1957.

Johnson, G. O. Motivating the slow learner. In R. D. Strom (Ed.), The inner-city classroom: Teacher behaviors. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1966. Pp. 111-130.

Johnson, H. A. Multimedia and innovative techniques for educating teachers of the disadvantaged. Journal of Teacher Education, 1968, 19, 85-90.

Keislar, E. R., & McNeil, J. D. The use of pupil accomplices to investigate teacher behavior. Journal of Experimental Education, 1959, 27, 237-240.

Kirman, J. M. Teacher survival in difficult schools. High Points, 1964, 46, 69-70.

Klopf, G. J., & Bowman, G. W. Teacher education in social context. New York: Mental Health, 1966.

Kornberg, L. Meaningful teachers for alienated children. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), Education in depressed areas. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963. Pp. 262-277.

Kounin, J. S., & Gump, P. V. The ripple effect in discipline. Elementary School Journal, 1958, 59, 158-162.

Kounin, J. S., & Gump, P. V. The comparative influences of punitive and nonpunitive teachers upon childrens' [sic] concepts of school misconduct. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1961, 52, 44-49.

Kvaraceus, W. C. Negro youth and social adaptation: The role of the school as an agent of change. In W. C. Kvaraceus, J. S. Gibson, F. Patterson, B. Seasholes, & J. D. Grambs (Eds.), Negro self-concept: Implications for school and citizenship. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965. Pp. 91-128.

Lail, S. S. Developmental task achievement of disadvantaged adolescents. High School Journal, 1968, 52, 89-97.

Leacock, E. B. Teaching and learning in city schools. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Levine, D. U. Issues in the provision of equal educational opportunity. Journal of Negro Education, 1968, 37, 4-14.

Linn, E. L. The socially disadvantaged child: Teacher correlates. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1966.

Loretan, J. O., & Umans, S. Teaching the disadvantaged new curriculum approaches. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966.

Malone, S. C. Teaching with heart. Grade Teacher, 1968, 86, 55-56.

Massachusetts State Board of Education. Because it is right - educationally. A Report of the Advisory Committee on Racial Imbalance and Education. Boston: Author, April, 1965.

Mastin, V. E. Teacher enthusiasm. Journal of Educational Research, 1963, 56, 385-386.

Matczynski, T. J. Reflections of a ghetto teacher. Ohio Schools, 1968, 46, 17-19, ff.

McCallon, E. L. Interpersonal perception characteristics of teachers. Journal of Experimental Education, 1966, 34, 97-100.

McGeoch, D. M. Learning to teach in urban schools. New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

Miller, H. L. Recapitulation. In H. L. Miller (Ed.), Education for the disadvantaged. New York: Free Press, 1967. P. 193.

Miller, H. L. The relation of social class to slum school attitudes among education students in an urban college. Journal of Teacher Education, 1968, 19, 416-424.

Moore, A. Realities of the urban classroom: Observations in elementary school. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1967.

Orleans, J. S., Clarke, D., Ostreicher, L., & Standlee, L. Some preliminary thoughts on criteria of teacher effectiveness. Journal of Educational Research, 1952, 45, 641-648.

Ornstein, A. C. Anxieties and forces which mitigate against ghetto school teachers. Journal of Secondary Education, 1968, 43, 243-254.

Ornstein, A. C. Discipline practices for teaching the disadvantaged. In A. C. Ornstein & P. D. Vairo (Eds.), How to teach disadvantaged youth. New York: McKay, 1969. Pp. 163-193. (a)

Ornstein, A. C. Theory practices for teaching disadvantaged youth. Journal of Negro Education, 1969, 38, 82-85. (b)

Page, E. B. Teacher comments and student performance: A seventy-four [sic] classroom experiment in school motivation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 49, 173-181.

Painter, G. The effect of a structured tutorial program on the cognitive and language development of culturally disadvantaged infants. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1969, 15, 279-294.

Paschal, B. J. A concerned teacher makes the difference. Arithmetic Teacher, 1966, 13, 203-205.

Passow, A. H. Toward creating a model urban school system: A study of the Washington, D. C. public schools. A report of the Washington, D. C. public schools. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967.

Perkins, H. V. Climate influences group learning. Journal of Educational Research, 1951, 45, 115-119.

Perkins, H. V. Classroom behavior and underachievement. American Educational Research Journal, 1965, 2, 1-12.

Phillips, J. A., Jr. Teacher typologies. High School Journal, 1967, 51, 26-31.

Riessman, F. The culturally deprived child. New York: Harper, 1962.

Riessman, F. Helping the disadvantaged pupil to learn more easily. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Rivlin, H. N. A new pattern for urban teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1966, 17, 177-184.

Rosenhan, D., & Greenwald, J. A. The effects of age, sex, and socioeconomic class on responsiveness to two classes of verbal reinforcement. Journal of Personality, 1965, 33, 108-121.

Roth, R. W. The effects of "black studies" on Negro fifth grade students. Journal of Negro Education, 1969, 38, 435-439.

Rousseve, R. J. Teachers of culturally disadvantaged American youth. Journal of Negro Education, 1963, 32, 141-121.

Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of teachers. Washington, D. C.: National Council on Education. 1960.

Scott, V. An exploratory study to identify the teaching behaviors that are used most frequently and are most crucial in teaching culturally disadvantaged children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Scott, W. S. Meeting the affective needs of disadvantaged children. In M. Cowles (Ed.), Perspectives in the education of disadvantaged children. Cleveland: World, 1967. Pp. 159-182.

Sexton, P. C. Education and income. New York: Viking, 1961.

Singer, I. J. Media and the ghetto. Audiovisual Instruction, 1968, 13, 860-864.

Storen, H. F. The disadvantaged early adolescent: More effective teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Strang, R. Teaching reading to the culturally disadvantaged in secondary schools. Journal of Reading, 1967, 10, 527-535.

Strom, R. D. Teaching in the slum school. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1965.

Strom, R. D. Teacher aspiration and attitude. In R. D. Strom (Ed.), The inner-city classroom: Teacher behaviors. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1966.

Taba, H., & Elkins, D. Teaching strategies for the culturally disadvantaged. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Tanner, J. R. In-service training for teachers of the disadvantaged. In H. Goldman (Ed.), Education and the disadvantaged. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, Conference Proceedings on the Disadvantaged, June 8-9, 1967. Pp. 53-64.

Task Force One reports. In M. D. Usdan & F. Bertolaet (Eds.), Development of school-university programs for the pre-service education of teachers for the disadvantaged through teacher education centers. Washington,D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965, Research Project No. F-068. Pp. 57-74.

Thelen, H. A. Classroom grouping for teachability. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Thelen, H. A. The evaluation of group instruction. In R. W. Tyler (Ed.), Educational evaluation: New roles, new means. National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1969. Pp. 115-155.

Tiedt, S. W. (Ed.), Teaching the disadvantaged child. New York: Oxford, 1968.

Torrance, E. P. Fostering creative behavior. In R. D. Strom (Ed.), The inner-city classroom: Teacher behaviors. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1699. Pp. 57-74.

Trout, L. Involvement through slanted language. In P. G. Kontos & J. J. Murphy (Eds.), Teaching urban youth: A source book for urban education, New York: Wiley, 1967. Pp. 23-44.

Turner, R. L., & Denny, D. A. Teacher characteristics, teacher behavior, and changes in pupil creativity. Elementary School Journal, 1969, 69, 265-270.

Vontress, C. E. Our demoralizing slum schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 1963, 45, 77-81.

Warren, P. B. A study of lower class and middle-upper class students' perceptions of the behavioral traits of the effective teacher. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1968.

Washburne, C., & Heil, L. M. What characteristics of teachers affect children's growth? School Review, 1960, 68, 420-428.

Wayson, W. W. Expressed motives of teachers in slum schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1966.

Whipple, G. Curriculum for the disadvantaged. In H. Goldman (Ed.), Education and the disadvantaged. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee Conference Proceedings on the Disadvantaged, June 8-9, 1967. Pp. 91-105.

White, W. Affective dimensions of teachers of disadvantaged children in six majority Negro school districts. Mimeographed, n. d.

Wilcox, P. R. Teacher attitudes and student achievement. Teachers College Record, 1967, 68, 371-379.

Wilkerson, D. A. Prevailing and needed emphasis in research on the education of disadvantaged children. Journal of Negro Education, 1964, 33, 346-357.

Williams, C. S. Preparing teachers for the disadvantaged: A pre-service program built on hunches. Contemporary Education, 1968, 39, 191-197.

Wirth, J. W. Relationships between teachers and opinions of disadvantaged children and measures of selected characteristics of these children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1966.

Withall, J. The development of a technique for the measurement of social-emotional climate. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1948.

Yee, A. H. Source and direction of causal influence in the teacher-pupil relationships. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 59, 275-282.